

Response

Applicant: Gary B. Gordon et al.

Serial No.: 09/812,252

Filed: March 19, 2001

Docket No.: 10010189-1

Title: IMPEDANCE SENSING SCREEN POINTING DEVICE

REMARKS

The following remarks are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed August 9, 2005. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gordon et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,057,540 ("Gordon")

With this Response, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-35, and requests reconsideration of these claims. Claims 1-35 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gordon et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,057,540 ("Gordon"). Independent claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for controlling the position of a screen pointer, and recites "a plurality of sensing elements against which a portion of the tip of a human digit may be placed", and "a controller coupled to each of the sensing elements for sensing an electrical property at each of the sensing elements". Independent claim 19 is directed to a method of controlling the position of a screen pointer, and recites "placing a portion of an appendage of the human hand against a plurality of sensing elements", and "sensing an impedance at each of the sensing elements".

The Examiner cited movement sensor 9 in Figure 1 of Gordon as apparently corresponding to "a plurality of sensing elements". (Office Action at para. no. 3, page 3). However, as shown in Figure 1 of Gordon, a human digit is not placed against movement sensor 9. Rather, the human digit is placed against the transparent stud 3, which is a separate and distinct element from the movement sensor 9. Thus, Gordon does not teach or suggest "a plurality of sensing elements against which a portion of the tip of a human digit may be placed", as recited in independent claim 1, or "placing a portion of an appendage of the human hand against a plurality of sensing elements", as recited in independent claim 19.

The Examiner cited Gordon at col. 4, lines 52-66, as apparently teaching or suggesting "sensing an electrical property at each of the sensing elements", as recited in independent claim 1, and "sensing an impedance at each of the sensing elements", as recited in independent claim 19. Gordon at col. 4, lines 52-66, discloses the following:

The preferred optical navigation optically detects motion by directly imaging as an array of pixels the various particular optical features visible at

Response

Applicant: Gary B. Gordon et al.

Serial No.: 09/812,252

Filed: March 19, 2001

Docket No.: 10010189-1

Title: IMPEDANCE SENSING SCREEN POINTING DEVICE

surface 5, much as human vision is believed to do. IR light reflected from a textured work surface pressed against surface 5 is focused onto a suitable array (say, 16x16 or 24x24) of photo detectors. The LED may be continuously on with either a steady or variable amount of illumination served to maximize some aspect of performance (e.g., the dynamic range of the photo detectors in conjunction with the albedo of the work surface). Alternatively, a charge accumulation mechanism coupled to the photo detectors may be "shuttered" (by current shunting switches) and the LED pulsed on and off to control the exposure by servoing the average amount of light.

The above-cited portion of Gordon discloses that "light" is sensed, and does not teach or suggest "sensing an electrical property at each of the sensing elements", as recited in independent claim 1, or "sensing an impedance at each of the sensing elements", as recited in independent claim 19. In addition, there is no teaching or suggestion in Gordon that the finger 7 shown in Figure 1 is placed against either the photo detectors or the charge accumulation mechanism mentioned in the above-cited portion of Gordon.

In view of the above, Gordon does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 1 or independent claim 19. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claims 1 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and requests allowance of these claims. Since dependent claims 2-18 and 20-35 further limit patentably distinct claim 1 or 19, and are further distinguishable over the cited reference, claims 2-18 and 20-35 are believed to be allowable over the cited reference. Allowance of claims 2-18 and 20-35 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-35 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-35 is respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(h)(i). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1078.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Response

Applicant: Gary B. Gordon et al.

Serial No.: 09/812,252

Filed: March 19, 2001

Docket No.: 10010189-1

Title: IMPEDANCE SENSING SCREEN POINTING DEVICE

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Jeff A. Holmen at the below-listed telephone number or Pamela Lau Kee at Telephone No. (408) 553-3059, Facsimile No. (408) 553-3063. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Agilent Technologies, Inc.
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Department, M/S DL429
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

Respectfully submitted,

Gary B. Gordon et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-0178
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 10/26/05
JAH:jmc

Jeff A. Holmen
Jeff A. Holmen
Reg. No. 38,492

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8:

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 26th day of October, 2005.

By Jeff A. Holmen
Name: Jeff A. Holmen